

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 23 2008****REMARKS**

Claims 43-59, 73, and 85-90 are now pending in the application. Claims 60-72, 74, and 76-84 are canceled by this amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

Applicants have amended the specification to correct a minor typographical error. Applicants submit that no new subject matter is added by this amendment.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 43-59, 73 and 85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Because the present application is a continuation of U.S. Pat. App. No. 09/915,248 (parent application) filed on July 25, 2001 each of the presently pending claims should be granted the effective filing date of the date of the parent application. Applicants respectfully submit that the requirement of a supramolecular oxo-anion, although within the scope of the application as filed, is not a requirement. Applicants direct the Office's attention to at least paragraphs 31-33 of the parent application. For example, paragraph 32 describes that oxo-anion can include molybdenum, phosphorous, etc. and has a general formula of A_nO_n . Late, paragraph 34 indicates that supramolecules are generally defined as relatively large molecules comprised of

individual subunits where each subunit is capable of performing a particular function. The supramolecule can include sub-units of a molecule, as discussed above, as claimed in the present application and disclosed in the parent application. Thus, the claims of the present application should be given a priority date of the filing of the parent application on July 25, 2001.

Regarding the amendment to the abstract including "the various compositions can be formed as a film", Applicants respectfully submit that support can be found throughout the parent application as filed. For example, paragraph 38 in the parent application "Without being bound to a particular theory of the operation of the present invention, it is believed that the metallic salts of the supramolecular oxo-anions of the present invention . . . (2) remain immobilized in the protective coating (i.e., paint or oxide) until needed to inhibit corrosion." In addition, paragraph 51 recites "The metallic salts of supramolecular oxo-anions can also be used as dopants for protective sol-gel coatings." In addition, the materials are disclosed to be able to adsorb onto aluminum oxide coatings. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that support for the amendment to the abstract can be found throughout the parent application.

Applicants further submit that the parent application provides support for a barrier to corrosion. Initially, applicants respectfully submit that the technical field of the application as filed is directed to corrosion inhibitors and to compositions therefore. Further, the parent application is directed to inhibiting corrosion. Nevertheless, to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicants have non-narrowingly amended the claims to recite "placing a corrosion inhibitor near the metal substrate."

Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejection of the claims.

Further, Applicants have amended independent Claim 43 to recite "N is an integer equal to 1 or higher." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 43 is clearly supported by the parent application.

Initially, as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims has support in the parent application to which the present application claims priority. Applicants submit that each of the claims should be given priority from the parent application.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are clear as filed. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended the claims for clarity and believe that each of the presently pending claims, are not disclosed or fairly rendered obvious by the cited art.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 43-59, 73 and 85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent Claim 43 to overcome the rejections raised by the Office. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 43 is clear as to the positioning of the elements and recites a value greater than zero for N.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 43-59, 73 and 85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tomlinson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,964,928) or Tomlinson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,759,244) or De Pue et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,322,560) or Floyd, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,330,635) or Ahearn, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,205,922) or Bradley et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,310,390) or Verma et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,024,892) or Verma (U.S. Pat. No. 6,503,420) or Dolan (U.S. Pat. No. 5,449,415) or McCormick et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,261,622) or Minevski et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,500,276). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Initially, independent Claim 43 recites "preparing a metal substrate . . . wherein the corrosion inhibitor is formed including: an oxo-anion . . . and an oxidic acid." While independent Claim 43 recites a corrosion inhibitor including an oxo-anion and oxidic acid, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or fairly render obvious a corrosion inhibitor including the materials recited in independent Claim 43.

Tomlinson '244 and Tomlinson '928 are both directed to coatings for surfaces. Although both appear to disclose a molecule including a metal atom, both references appear to disclose using only a material or its acid. Further, both disclose that to achieve low pH levels an acid of the selected compound is used. See Tomlinson '244; col. 5, lines 19-21 and Tomlinson '928; col. 13, lines 4 – 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Tomlinson reference disclose each of the elements in presently pending independent Claim 43.

DePue et al. is directed to coatings for materials that include aluminum flake pigments. Although the coatings may include cereous compounds, Applicants respectfully submit that DePue et al. does not anticipate or fairly render obvious a corrosion inhibitor including an oxo-anion and an oxidic acid.

Floyd Jr. discloses a coating that must be cross linked and includes various metallic salts, such as chromates. See Floyd Jr., col. 6, lines 36-51. Applicants respectfully submit that Floyd Jr., therefore, does not anticipate or fairly render obvious a corrosion inhibitor including an oxo-anion and an oxidic acid.

Ahearn, Jr. et al. is directed to an anodization process that can include a sodium molybdate inhibitor. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that Ahearn, Jr. et al. does not anticipate or fairly render obvious a corrosion inhibitor including an oxo-anion and an oxidic acid.

Brady et al. discloses various acids, such as molybdic and tungstic acid, but fails to disclose a corrosion inhibitor including an oxo-anion or oxidic acid as recited in independent Claim 43. See Brady et al., col. 3, lines 50-62.

The two references to Verma, Verma '420 and Verma et al. '892, are directed to dehumidification mixtures. Applicants respectfully submit first, that both require the material to be placed in a buffer for dehumidification. See Verma '420 and Verma et al. '892, Abstracts. Second, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Verma '420 and Verma et al. '892 disclose preparing a metal substrate, as recited in independent Claim 43. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Verma '420 is at least not prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b). As discussed above, independent Claim 43, and each of the

claims that depend therefrom, is supported by the parent application. Therefore, Verma '420, which issued on January 7, 2003, is not prior art under § 102(b).

Dolan and McCormick et al. are discussed together here, as in the Office Action. Dolan discloses a process for treating metals that includes a dry-in-place acidic liquid that includes multiple components, such as an anion with at least four fluorine atoms and at least one other atom. See Dolan; Abstract. McCormick et al. discloses a nearly identical process and material. See McCormick et al.; col. 2, lines 20-30. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that neither Dolan nor McCormick et al. anticipate or fairly render obvious a corrosion inhibitor, including an oxo-anion and an oxidic acid, where both include a selected element "A", as recited in Claim 43.

Further, Applicants note that McCormick et al. was issued on March 26, 2002. For reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that McCormick et al. is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Finally, Minevski et al. is directed to a conversion coating for metal substrates. Initially, Applicants note that Minevski et al. issued on December 31, 2002. Therefore, Minevski et al. is at least not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Moreover, Minevski et al. discloses polymetalates or hetro-polymetalates. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Minevski et al. does not disclose or fairly render obvious a corrosion inhibitor including an oxo-anion and an oxidic acid.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 43 is both clear and supported by the parent application. Therefore, the subject matter of independent Claim 43 should have an effective filing date of July 25, 2001. Moreover,

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the references cited in the rejection does not anticipate or fairly render obvious independent Claim 43, either alone or in combination.

Applicants respectfully that claims that depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 43 include a patentable subject matter. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend from independent Claim 43, as filed in the application, lack any clarity issues in the first instance. For example, dependent Claims 51-54 recite "supramolecule." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that at least these claims, which depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 43, are supported by the parent application and are also not anticipated or fairly rendered obvious by the art cited in the rejection.

Dependent Claims 55 and 56 recite "a salt of a cation" and "a salt having a general formula . . . wherein D is a metal cation." Applicants respectfully submit that a salt of a cation and a salt including a selected metal cation are not anticipated or fairly rendered obvious by the art cited in the rejections.

Further, dependent Claims 58 and 59 are directed to forming a polymer of an oxo-anion and an oxidic acid and where the polymer releases an oxo-anion in a moisture rich environment. Applicants respectfully submit that the method recited in dependent Claims 58 and 59 are not anticipated or fairly rendered obvious by the art cited in the rejections.

NEW CLAIM

New Claims 86-90 are added by this amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 86, and the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom,

are also not anticipated or fairly rendered obvious by the art cited in the rejections. At least because a supramolecule, as recited in independent Claim 86, is not disclosed or fairly rendered obvious, either alone or in combination, by the art cited in the rejections. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 86 and the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2008

By: 

Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLT/srh